

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			•		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/558,801	11/29/2005	Antonio Cosme Gomez	932.1336	6905	
21831 WOLF BLOCK	7590 10/29/2007 C SCHORR AND SOLIS -	COHEN LLP	EXAMINER		
250 PARK AVENUE			PESELEV, ELLI		
NEW YORK, 1	NY 10177		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		;	1623		
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
. Office Action Commence		10/558,801	COSME GOMEZ ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Elli Peselev	1623		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE is is a sound of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. 8 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Set This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Dispositi	on of Claims	,			
5) □ 6) ☑ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati	Claim(s) 1,6,9,12-19,22 and 26-31 is/are pendidal Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,6,9,12-19,22 and 26-31 is/are reject Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the organization.	vn from consideration. ed. election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119		7.00.011.01.101.11.11.10-132.		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment		• •	÷		
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P. 6) Other:	te		

Art Unit: 1623

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible asserted utility or a well established utility.

Specifically claim 27 is directed to a method of preventing bacterial or protozoan infection. The broadest reasonable interpretation of the term infection merely requires that one microorganism gain entry into the cells of a host. There is no evidence that entry would be prevented, therefore that utility would not be credible.

Claim 27 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Applicant's arguments filed September 14, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that the use of azithromycin as a preventive treatment is well known in the art. This argument has not been found persuasive since the definition of the terminology "preventive treatment" is not set forth in the specification. Therefore, said terminology encompasses the preventing a single microorganism entry into a host cell. Since there is no evidence that entry would be prevented, the above stated rejection has not been overcome.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1623

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 6, 9, 12-17, 22, 26-28, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Asero et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,277,829). Or Khamar et al (WO 02/07736 A1)

Asero disclose the claimed formulation comprising azithromycin and citric acid, wherein the molar ratio of azithromycin to citric acid is about 1:0.67 to 1:1.5 and the pH is adjusted to 5.5-7.6 (column 3, lines 51-57) and having concentration of 10% (column 4, lines 1-2).

Art Unit: 1623

Khamar et al disclose dissolving cirtric acid in water, adjusting the pH to 4 to 6 and adding azithromycin. Page 4, Example 1). An addition salt comprising azithromycin and citric acid would have been inherently formed from such a process.

Applicant's arguments filed September 14, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that under conditions disclosed by Asero, azithromycin hydrogen citrate should not be formed. This argument has not been found persuasive since applicant has not presented any evidence that the claimed salt is not present in the composition disclosed by Asero.

Applicant also contends that Khamar does not disclose the isolation of the salt formed. This argument has not been found persuasive since the present are not limited to an isolated azithromycin hydrogen salt but encompass said salt in admixture with any other additional component. Applicant further contends that the conditions disclosed by Khamar would not result in the formation of azithromycin hydrogen citrate. This argument has not been found persuasive since applicant has not presented any evidence that the claimed salt is not present in the composition disclosed by Khamar.

Claims 1, 6 9, 12-19, 22 and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aero et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,277,829) or Khamar et al (WO 02/07736 A1).

Each of Asero et al and Khamar et al discloses combining citric acid and azithromycin but does not disclose isolation of azithromycin hydrogen citrate by crystallization. However, since crystalline azithromycin is well known in the art, such as

Art Unit: 1623

azithromycin dihydrate disclosed by Khamar et al, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made would have been motivated to crystallize citric salt of azithromycin because said salt would have been expected to possess similar properties as known crystalline forms of azithromycin.

Applicant's arguments filed September 14, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has not presented any evidence that azithromycin hydrogen citrate is not present in the compositions disclosed by the cited prior art. In the event that the claimed salt is not present, note the claimed compound is identical to the known compound, azithromycin, with the exception that the salt is now claimed. Since salts are generally recognized as having superior solubility properties, in the absence of unexpected result or property, claims to the salt of a known compound are considered obvious over a known compound.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1623

Page 6

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-

0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Shaojia Jiang can be reached on (571) 272-0627. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Elli Peselev

ELLI PESELEV PRIMARY EXAMINER

CB011P 1200